UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,098	01/31/2002	Fabio Casati	10010118-1	6026

22879 7590 09/28/2009

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER	
NASH, LASHANYA RENEE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2453	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/28/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
jessica.l.fusek@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/066,098	CASATI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LASHANYA R. NASH	2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 April 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the BPAI decision filed 30 April 2009. Claims 1-26 are presented for further consideration.

In view of the BPAI decision filed on 30 April 2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below. A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kuno et al. ["Conversations + Interferences = Business Logic"-retrieved from the Internet], hereinafter referred to as Kuno.

In reference to claim 1, Kuno discloses:

- A method for selecting a conversation logic at run-time for a workflow definition that includes at least one node with no hard-coded conversation logic (abstract; title page), the method comprising the steps of:
- a) maintaining a conversation logic repository (i.e. UDDI registry of conversation definitions; *3.2 Web Service Conversation Language*, page 5) that includes at

least one conversation logic that is external to the workflow definition (i.e. conversation is implemented differently than the workflow logic; *5 Related Work*, page 12, paragraph 2);

- b) when executing the node with no hard-coded conversation logic (i.e. e-service client not hard-coded with conversation logic; *4.1 Client automation*, page 10), dynamically discovering a service associated with the node with no hard-coded conversation logic (i.e. e-services discovery; *2. Approach*, page 1);
- c) determining a corresponding conversation logic in the conversation logic repository based on the discovered service (i.e. conversation mapped to appropriate service; *4. Dynamic Conversation Controller for E-services*; paragraphs 1-3; pages 8-9); and
- d) dynamically plugging in the determined conversation logic into the node at run time (i.e. conversation implemented dynamically during e-service communication; *4.1. Client automation*, page 10).

In reference to claim 3, Kuno discloses:

- A method for selecting a conversation logic at run-time (abstract; title page) comprising the steps of:
- maintaining a conversation logic repository that includes at least one conversation logic (i.e. UDDI registry of conversation definitions; *3.2 Web Service Conversation Language*, page 5);

- at run-time, sending a service selection query to an electronic services platform or other service broker (i.e. e-service discovery*; 2 Approach*, page 2) ;
- receiving a returned service identifier (i.e. business service information in message; *3.1. UDDI Registries*, page 4); and selecting a conversation logic from the conversation logic repository based on the returned service identifier (i.e. conversation mapped to appropriate service; *4. Dynamic Conversation Controller for E-services*; paragraphs 1-3; pages 8-9).

In reference to claim 11, Kuno discloses:

- A system for dynamically selecting a conversation logic at run-time for a workflow definition that includes at least one node with no hard-coded conversation logic (abstract; title page) comprising:
- a) a workflow engine (*Related Work*, page 12, paragraph 2) for processing workflow definitions (i.e. service definition; *3.3. Web-Service Definition Language*; page 7);
- b) a conversation logic repository that includes at least one conversation logic (i.e. UDDI registry of conversation definitions; *3.2 Web Service Conversation Language*, page 5) and that is external to the workflow definition (i.e. conversation is implemented differently than the workflow logic; *5 Related Work*, page 12, paragraph 2);
- c) a dynamic conversation logic selection mechanism for receiving a service identifier that is associated with a service at run-time and based thereon for

selecting a conversation logic for interacting with the service at run-time (i.e. conversation mapped to appropriate service; *4. Dynamic Conversation Controller for E-services*; paragraphs 1-3; pages 8-9).

In reference to claim 2, Kuno discloses the method of claim 1wherein the step of when executing the node with no hard-coded conversation logic, dynamically discovering a service associated with the node with no hard-coded conversation logic includes the steps of: determining a service based on a service selection rule; receiving a service reference; and wherein the step of determining a corresponding conversation logic in the conversation logic repository based on the discovered service further includes the step of using the service reference to determine a conversation logic for the determined service (*4. Dynamic Conversation Controller for E-services*; paragraphs 1-3; pages 8-9).

In reference to claims 4 and 15, Kuno discloses the method of claim 3 wherein each conversation logic is associated with at least one service (*4. Dynamic Conversation Controller for E-services*; paragraphs 1-3; pages 8-9).

In reference to claims 5 and 16, Kuno discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the conversation logic is for the exclusive use of a given composite service (*4. Dynamic Conversation Controller for E-services*; paragraphs 1-3; pages 8-9).

In reference to claims 6 and 17, Kuno discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the conversation logic is shared by two or more composite services (*4. Dynamic Conversation Controller for E-services*; paragraphs 1-3; pages 8-9).

In reference to claims 7 and 18, Kuno discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the conversation logic is not defined in a workflow at process definition time, the workflow defining a procedure that executes services (*5 Related Work*, page 12, paragraph 2)

In reference to claim 8, Kuno discloses the method of claim 3 further comprising: interacting with a dynamic service discovery mechanism; and dynamically discovering services (*2. Approach*, page 1)

In reference to claims 9 and 19, Kuno discloses the method of claim 3 further comprising the step of: performing late binding of the conversation logic at run-time (*4.1. Client automation*, page 10).

In reference to claims 10 and 20, Kuno discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the repository is one of a single central database and multiple distributed files (*3.2 Web Service Conversation Language*, page 5).

In reference to claim 12, Kuno discloses the system of claim 11 further comprising: d) a source for services; wherein the source discovers services based on a service

selection rule; wherein the dynamic conversation logic selection mechanism (DCLSM) (i.e. dynamic conversation controller) selects appropriate conversation logic from the conversation logic repository based on a discovered service, (*4. Dynamic Conversation Controller for E-services*; pages 8-9).

In reference to claim 13, Kuno discloses the system of claim 12 wherein the source for services is one of a service broker, a service marketplace, an e-services platform, a company, and an entity (i.e. e-service; *4.1 Client automation*, page 10).

In reference to claim 14, Kuno the system of claim 11, wherein only services that have a conversation protocol compatible with one of the conversation logic available in the repository are selected (; *4.1 Client automation*, page 10).

In reference to claims 21-23, Kuno discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the conversation logic repository comprises plural conversation logic, wherein each of the plural conversation logic specifies a corresponding set of operations to be performed on a respective service, and wherein determining the corresponding conversation logic comprises selecting one of the plural conversation logic based on the discovered service (*3.2 Web Service Conversation Language*, pages 5-6).

In reference to claim 24, Kuno discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one conversation logic comprises a specification of operations to be performed on the determined service (*2 Approach*, pages 2-3).

In reference to claims 25-26, Kuno discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one conversation logic comprises a specification of operations to be performed on a service identified by the returned service identifier (*3.1. UDDI Registries*; page 4).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LASHANYA R. NASH whose telephone number is (571)272-3957. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LaShanya R Nash/
Examiner, Art Unit 2453
September 11, 2009

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457